

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claim 6 is currently being cancelled.

Claims 1-5 and 9-18 are currently being amended.

Claims 19 and 20 are currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and adding the claims as set forth above, claims 1-5 and 9-20 are now pending in this application.

Objection to the Title and the Specification:

In the Office Action, the title and the specification were objected to for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Based on the amendments made to the title and the specification, these objections have been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph:

In the Office Action, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph, as being indefinite, since assertedly “the limitation ‘predetermined relative priority’ is vague and indefinite because it is unclear what is predetermined relative priority.” In reply, presently pending independent claim 1 has been amended to make it explicitly clear by way of a step of downloading information with respect to a relative priority for downloading the second and third web pages with respect to each other. As clearly explained on page 4, lines 25-35 of the specification, the second and third web pages have a relative priority assigned to them, whereby the second web page may be five times more likely (based on past experience) to be downloaded by a user than the third web page, and thus the second web page has a five times relative priority with respect to the third web page. Thus, by way of example, when a user clicks on the first web page, the second web page is automatically started to be

downloaded to the user's computer at a five times faster rate than the third web page that is also automatically started to be downloaded to the user's computer.

While it is believed that the original claims are not indefinite based on the description of the allegedly "indefinite" feature in the specification, the independent claims have been amended to make that feature even more explicit.

Accordingly, the presently pending claims are fully compliant with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163444 to Kotzin. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 has been amended to include the features of now-canceled claim 6 as well as other features, whereby "subsequent to downloading address information of the second and third links on the first web page, but prior to actuation of either the second or third links, commencing the process of downloading elements of content of the second and third web pages, wherein the process of downloading the elements of content of the second and third web pages is performed on the basis of the relative priority of the second and third web pages." Also, presently pending independent claim 1 now recites a step of downloading, from a server to a client, information with respect to a relative priority for downloading the second and third web pages with respect to each other. (emphasis added)

As explained above with reference to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph rejection of the claims, the second and third web pages have a relative priority assigned to them, whereby the second web page may be five times more likely (based on past experience) to be downloaded by a user than the third web page, and thus the second web page has a five times relative priority with respect to the third web page. Thus, by way of example, when a user clicks on the first web page, the second web page is automatically started to be downloaded to the user's computer at a five times faster rate than the third web page that is also automatically started to be downloaded to the user's computer.

The claimed downloading, from a server to a client, information with respect to a relative priority for downloading the second and third web pages with respect to each other, is not disclosed or suggested by Kotzin. Rather, Kotzin is directed to a method to optimize information downloading, whereby the web page or pages correspond to hyperlinks contained within a first web page are automatically downloaded to a memory of a device prior to any intentional selection of the link by a user. See Abstract of Kotzin. In Kotzin, a user defines a PDL or PDLs for one or more web pages that he/she frequently visits, whereby that information is used to cause a server to initiate downloading of links on those frequently visited web pages to the user according to the user-defined priorities for those links. See paragraphs 0026-0028 of Kotzin. In Kotzin, the user defines the priorities, whereby in the presently claimed invention the server defines the priorities. This is an important distinction, because if a majority of users in the system of Kotzin define a particular link to be the highest priority link, a congestion situation may occur, while in the presently claimed invention the server controls the priorities assigned to the links and thus can eliminate or lessen any possible congestion problems when multiple users access a web page having multiple links at the same time.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Kotzin.

Presently pending independent claims 12 and 16 have been amended to recite the above features in a slightly different manner than how they are recited in presently pending independent claim 1, whereby those claims are also believed to patentably distinguish over Kotzin.

New Claims:

New claims 19 and 20 have been added to recite features regarding how the relative priority is assigned to the second and third web pages, whereby such features provide a further reason for patentability of that claim, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 11, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819